

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 4-7 are now in the application. Claims 4-7 are subject to examination.

Claim 4 has been amended. Claim 7 has been added.

Claim 4 has been amended to correct a minor grammatical error.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 4 and 6 have been rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,705,083 to Vennemeyer et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,899,712 to De Bruyn et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,795,970 to Keathley et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 4 defines a method of producing a high-pressure fuel accumulator for a fuel injection system. The method includes a step of forming the tubular base body (of the high-pressure fuel accumulator) together with the fuel supply port, the fuel discharge port, and the fixing element as a one-piece integral component.

Vennemeyer et al. do not teach or even suggest anything related to forming a high-pressure fuel accumulator for a fuel injection system. Rather, Vennemeyer et al. teach forming a master cylinder 22 of a hydraulic braking system 20 (See column 3, lines 37-53). The master cylinder 22 will be

mounted to a reservoir 26 to receive hydraulic brake fluid, and the master cylinder 22 will be connected to hydraulic fluid lines for transporting the hydraulic brake fluid to brake cylinders or calipers. Pistons 28 are disposed in the master cylinder 22 in order to move hydraulic fluid into and out of the master cylinder 22. The method for forming the master cylinder 22, which is taught by Vennemeyer et al., clearly does not include a step of forming a tubular base body of a high-pressure fuel accumulator together with a fuel supply port, a fuel discharge port, and a fixing element as a one-piece integral component.

Even if De Bruyn et al. and Keathley et al. did suggest the modifications to Vennemeyer et al. as alleged by the Examiner, the claimed invention could not have been suggested.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 5 has been rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,705,083 to Vennemeyer et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,899,712 to De Bruyn et al. and U.S. Patent No. 3,795,970 to Keathley et al. and further in view of Official Notice under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The invention as defined by claim 5 would not have been suggested for the reasons specified above with regard to the teaching in Vennemeyer et al.

Claim 7 has been added to even further distinguish the invention from the prior art. Support for the claim can be found by referring to the specification at page 2, line 28 though page 3, line 9.

Vennemeyer et al. do not teach or suggest using one profile blank to extrude a profile blank, and separating the profile blank into a plurality of tubular base bodies that each have at least one connector strip and/or one fixing strip.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 4. Claim 4 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 4.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 4-7 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Werner H. Stemer/  
Werner H. Stemer  
(Reg. No. 34,956)

MPW:cgm

November 13, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP  
P.O. Box 2480  
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480  
Tel.: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101